Reflect on the Data

**Team to Teach Tool 5.3- Reflecting on the Data (**use Tool 5.1 for data resources)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Answer** | **What other info. do we need?** |
| 1. What sources of data did we examine? | ARMT – Previous Year 3rd grade  SAT 10 – Previous Year 3rd grade  DIBELS – Previous Year 3rd grade  Scott Foresman Unit Assessments/Fluency Passages  STAR  AR  Running Records  Professional Judgment from Teacher | Attendance  Office Referrals  Special Education Eligibility |
| 2. What parts of these data really caught our attention? | **ARMT**  Open-ended responses:   * ‘Use strategies to comprehend functional and textual/informational material’  |  |  | | --- | --- | | # children | # Points Received | | 0 | 6 | | 0 | 5 | | 1 | 4 | | 6 | 3 | | 9 | 2 | | 9 | 1 | | 0 | 0 |   ARMT Multiple-Choice responses for same objective:  Only 2 students scored below 50% (earned less than 9 points) on this section. 1 student scored 50% on this subtest while all other students scored above 50%.   * ‘Use strategies to comprehend literary/recreational materials’  |  |  | | --- | --- | | # children | # Points Received | | 0 | 6 | | 2 | 5 | | 10 | 4 | | 6 | 3 | | 2 | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 0 |   ARMT Multiple-choice responses for same objective:  7 students scored below 50%, 5 students scored equal to 50%, while all other students scored above 50%.    **SAT 10**   * 9 of the students assessed scored in stanines 1-3 for Structural Analysis * 4 of the students assessed scored in stanines 1-3 for Phonetic Analysis – vowels; Multiple Meaning Words; Context Clues; and Thinking Skills * 3 of the students assessed scored in stanines 1-3 for all 4 subtests (Literary, Informational, Functional, and Initial Understanding) for Reading Comprehension * 2 of the students assessed scored in stanines 1-3 for all of the subtests listed in bullet 1-3 * In the Reading Comprehension Category 3 students scored in stanines 1-3 for all of the subtests (Literary, Informational, Functional, Initial Understanding, Interpretation, Critical Analysis, Strategies, and Thinking Skills)   **AR**   * 19 out of 20 students achieved 80 percent correct or above on their quizzes according to the Diagnostic Report * 13 out of 20 students achieved the goal of 90 percent correct or above on their quizzes according to the Diagnostic Report * 74 percent of material read was fiction; 26 percent of material read was non-fiction * 15 of the students spent 15 or more minutes reading daily.   **Scott Foresman**   * Class percentage from baseline to Unit 4 assessment has increased 43% * Fluency assessments indicate ORF for target goal is 82% | An indicator or some type of measure of how seriously the students are taking the accountability tests. |
| 3. What parts of these data encourage you the most? | **Encouragement**   * SF Unit Assessment Scores are gradually increasing. * 7 of the ‘matched students’ scored Level IV on the ARMT and in stanines 5-9 for Total Reading on the SAT |  |
| 4. What parts concern you the most? | **Concerns**   * 5 students in this class scored below 50% correct on the ARMT Open-Ended and Multiple-Choice Responses for ‘Use strategies to comprehend functional and textual/informational materials’. * 4 students in this class scored between 55% – 64% correct on ARMT Multiple-Choice for ‘literary/recreational reading’ but received less than 50% credit on the Open-Ended Responses * Of the 9 students mentioned in bullets 1-2, three scored in stanines 1-3 in all Reading Subgroups on the SAT * Only 26% of AR material read by this class is non-fiction and according to the ARMT results this is a weakness for the majority of the students * The average book level read in this class was 3.9 * The average amount of time spent engaged in daily reading of AR books was 23 minutes. * ORF accuracy is 98-100 percent for 90% of the children. If students are on the average reading AR books 3.9, and the SF Fluency Passages are grade level for this time of year – are these scores aligning? | Reason why students are not reading more non-fiction.   * Do they have adequate access in the library? * Is the teacher utilizing MPS Resources such as Time for Kids, Read Naturally, Six Minute Solution, and Reading Stories for Comprehension Success |
| 5. What differences, if any, are there in grades, attendance, and behavior among our students? | * Academic Grades indicate that 75% of the class maintains a C average or better in core subjects; 85% of the students have a C average or better in reading. * Results on Scott Foresman Unit Assessments suggest that these students have the ability to score better on both ARMT and SAT. * 2 students have attendance issues. * Inappropriate behavior according to the teacher and offenses reported to the office does not seem to be a contributing factor. | How does the rigor of these accountability assessments measure up with that of Scott Foresman? |
| 6. Do some groups achieve at higher levels than others? | yes | What are the contributing factors that would produce higher achievement results for one group of students and not all?  Of these factors, which can be controlled, duplicated, and impacted from the school level?  What instructional methods contributed to this discrepancy?  Can instruction be altered to impact achievement for all students in this same manner?  Student observation needs to occur to ensure that various accommodations are implemented according to students’ learning modality. |
| 7. Which students are not working to potential? What evidence is there that students who were given more challenging work also achieved more? | * Joshua, Charles (Dillon), James (Joe), Kayla, Marquavius, Caitlin, Bryan may not be performing to their highest potential in all areas based on data examined * There is no evidence that students who were given more challenging work achieved more. | Why aren’t the students being challenged to achieve more?  What might that look like inside the classroom?  Do we need to make more accommodations for the students? Are the students receiving Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III instruction? |
| 8. Which groups appear to need instruction more tailored to their learning styles? | All students would benefit.  The special education students and intensive students need more instruction tailored to their learning style. | Teacher may need to administer a learning styles inventory. Instruction observed was mostly lecture even after side-by-side coaching and modeling of active engagement.  Use multiple forms of data to identify miscues, weakness, and interference. |
| 9. What other questions does this data raise for you? | Reason why students are not reading more non-fiction.   * Do they have adequate access in the library? * Is the teacher utilizing MPS Resources such as Time for Kids, Read Naturally, Six Minute Solution, and Reading Stories for Comprehension Success? * How does the rigor of these accountability assessments measure up with that of Scott Foresman? * Why hasn’t the teacher, reading coach, principal, etc. drilled down the data before this point to establish possible deficiencies and appropriate instructional and intervention efforts? * Does the data indicating the amount of non-fiction material read hold true for other grades? Especially second and third grade? Could increasing exposure and instruction with type of material in previous grade positively impact student achievement? * Are the students receiving differentiated instruction in reading on a daily basis? Are small groups pulled regularly? Is the program being taught to fidelity? Is the teacher aligning her instruction to the MPS Planner? Is the teacher providing instruction on all genres of text within each unit and story? * Are the students being informally assessed prior to the formal assessments so that instruction can be adjusted to meet these needs? Formative assessments used? Other Summative assessments used? * Are the students receiving all three Tiers to reinforce skills? | We need to track students’ data to see if they are continually having the same problems.  Identify the root cause of the problem |
| 10. What are the implications for what our professional learning team should focus on this year? | 1. **Providing Differentiated Instruction and Intervention Efforts based upon multiple sources of data. Developing effective strategies to use during instruction so deficiencies can be alleviated once data is analyzed.** 2. **Implementing strategies for increasing the amount of non-fiction, functional and textual/informational material read and utilized for instruction. As well as requiring higher order processes at the application level and beyond for this type of material.** 3. **The professional learning team needs to focus on student’s interferences and integrate research based strategies to help students become skillful readers through the five basic components of reading.** | We need to consistently take and use anecdotal notes to monitor students’ performance.  We need to provide feedback to students after assessments to help reinforce and clear up any misconceptions.  Feedback needs to be done in a timely manner and provide explicit support to enable remediation and/or re-teaching to occur. Students need to know more than what the correct answer is – they must know how to get to the correct answer. |